UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,591	07/05/2001	Jiyunji Uchida	20911-06160	4107

758 7590 04/09/2004

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
ZHOU, TING	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2173	13

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/900,591	Applicant(s) UCHIDA ET AL.	
	Examin r Ting Zhou	Art Unit 2173	

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 March 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-11,13-21,27 and 28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-11,13-21,27 and 28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 12 March 2004 have been received and entered. Claims 1-28 as amended are pending in the application. Of the above claims, claims 1, 12 and 22-26 have been cancelled by the applicant and are therefore withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 27 and 28 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 13-14, 17 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Brien U.S. Patent 6,587,831.

Referring to claims 27 and 28, O'Brien teaches a schedule management system comprising a schedule table provided on the internal server (host server), the schedule table storing a schedule created by the managing party (column 1, lines 58-66 and column 2, lines 16-33), a common schedule table provided on the public web server (displaying the schedule to the client side machines via an online connection to the Internet) (column 2, lines 1-5 and column 3, lines 5-8), the common schedule table storing the schedule transferred from the internal server so that the managed parties refer to the schedule (the host server sends information regarding the schedule, such as displaying a final schedule, to the client side machine via a display and an Internet connection) (column 1, lines 58-66 and column 6, lines 18-25) and receiving means provided on the public web server, the receiving means receiving modification data from one or more of the managed parties, wherein the internal server is configured to receive the modification data from the public web server (users can generate, update and view the schedule via options on the online display menu) (column 2, lines 16-33, column 4, lines 58-67 and column 6, lines 18-51), modify the schedule stored in the schedule table with the modification data, and transfer the modified schedule to the common schedule table (revising, updating and regenerating the schedule) (column 2, lines 25-33 and column 6, lines 18-51), wherein the internal server is further configured to reject a direct access from the managed parties (the users of the system cannot directly access schedule information stored on the host server; modification and updates to the schedule are processed by receiving user commands from the online display

menu) (column 3, lines 24-34 and column 6, lines 18-30). This is further shown in Figures 3 and 5.

Referring to claims 2 and 13, O'Brien teaches the public web server is further configured to provide each of the managed parties with a modification means for generating the modification data, wherein the receiving means further receives the modification data entered via the modification means by the managed parties (each of the plurality of client side machines can provide information for the host server to revise the schedule) (column 2, lines 16-33 and column 4, lines 18-30).

Referring to claims 3 and 14, O'Brien teaches the transfer of the schedule to the common schedule table being automatically activated in response to the modification being completed (when the schedule is complete, the host server automatically makes the schedule available for viewing by the client side machines) (column 4, lines 58-67).

Referring to claims 6 and 17, O'Brien teaches the public web server is connected to the managed parties through the Internet (column 3, lines 5-13 and Figure 1), wherein the public web server is further configured to provide each of the managed parties with a page for inquiring the schedule stored in the common schedule table through the Internet (a menu is provided to the users of the system that allows them to view the current schedule; also, requests made from the inbound queue, by the client side machines, to access the scheduling engine are received through the Internet) (column 4, lines 59-63 and column 6, lines 18-30).

Referring to claim 7, O'Brien teaches the public web server is connected to the managed parties through the Internet (column 3, lines 5-13 and Figure 1), wherein the modification means include a page for entering the modification data (column 2, lines 15-32 and column 6, lines 44-

50), and wherein, in response to a click of a transfer button provided on the page, the modification data entered in the page is transferred to the public web server (when the modification of the schedule is complete, the current schedule can be transferred to the managers and employees on command by an active "push") (column 2, lines 1-5, column 4, lines 58-65 and column 6, lines 18-22).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-5, 8-11, 15-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Brien U.S. Patent 6,587,831, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Matsuzaki et al. U.S. Patent 5,767,848.

Referring to claims 4 and 15, O'Brien teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. Specifically, he teaches displaying the schedule when initiation of the processing unit in response to requests is completed. However, O'Brien fails to explicitly teach receiving and displaying progress data associated with initiation of the processing unit. Matsuzaki et al. teach a system managing a schedule similar to that of O'Brien. In addition, Matsuzaki et al. further teach providing progress input means (via the progress data input button), wherein the

receiving means further receives progress data entered via the progress input means by the managed parties (receiving data from the user) and wherein the controller is configured to record, receive and display progress data in the schedule stored in the schedule table, as recited in column 1, lines 63-67, column 2, lines 1-6 and column 9, lines 40-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the schedule management system of O'Brien to include the progress input means taught by Matsuzaki et al. It would have been obvious for one to make such a combination in order to allow users of the schedule system to easily update and view the progress of the tasks being worked on, or updated in the host server; users can see how close to completion the tasks and updates are.

Referring to claims 5, and 16, O'Brien teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. In particular, O'Brien teaches the transfer of the modified schedule table to the common schedule table (showing the modified schedule to the user on the display), as recited in column 1, lines 58-67 and continuing onto column 2, lines 1-32. However, O'Brien fails to explicitly teach transfer of the schedule to the common schedule table automatically when the progress data has been recorded. Matsuzaki et al. teach a system managing a schedule similar to that of O'Brien. In addition, Matsuzaki et al. further teach displaying the progress data on the schedule automatically when the progress data has been recorded, or received from the user (via the development progress monitoring means), as recited in column 2, lines 66-67 and continuing onto column 3, lines 1-5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the schedule management system of O'Brien to include the automatic display of received

progress data, as taught by Matsuzaki et al., in order for the system and method to automatically transfer the schedule to the common schedule table when the progress data has been recorded. It would have been obvious to make such a combination in order to allow users of the schedule system to easily update and view the progress of the tasks being worked on; users can see how close to completion the tasks are; also, every user of the system would be able to view the schedule with the progress of all of the tasks shown on it.

Referring to claim 8, O'Brien teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. He also teaches the common schedule table provided in a public web server outside the managing party, the web server being connected to the managed parties through the Internet (the client side machines and host server are connected via the Internet) (column 3, lines 5-8 and Figure 1). However, O'Brien fails to explicitly teach progress input means for entering progress data and wherein, in response to a click of a transfer button, the progress data is transferred to the public web server. Matsuzaki et al. teach a system managing a schedule similar to that of O'Brien. In addition, Matsuzaki et al. further teach a page for entering the progress data (the display page containing the progress data input button) and wherein, in response to a click of a transfer button provided on the page (progress data input button), the progress data entered in the page is transferred to the system (the data entered is received and stored in the system), as recited in column 9, lines 40-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the schedule management system of O'Brien to include the progress data input means taught by Matsuzaki et al. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination in order to allow users of the schedule system to easily update and view the

progress of the tasks being worked on; users can see how close to completion the tasks are; this would also make it as simple as possible to enter progress data on tasks; all the users have to do is enter the progress status and the information is transferred to be stored in the system.

Referring to claims 9 and 18, while O'Brien teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, he fails to explicitly teach the internal server (host server) configured to display progress representative of the progress data in a hierarchical format. Matsuzaki et al. teach a system managing a schedule similar to that of O'Brien. In addition, Matsuzaki et al. further teach displaying the progress data in a hierarchical format (displaying the progress of the processes in the configuration tree, which shows the hierarchical relation between the parts), as recited in column 16, lines 33-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the schedule management system of O'Brien to include the hierarchical display of task progress taught by Matsuzaki et al. It would have been obvious to make such a combination in order to allow users of the schedule system to easily update and view the progress of the tasks being worked on. Furthermore, it would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination so the users can tell by just looking at the progress/status reports, the order of the tasks, i.e., what tasks are parents of other tasks and what tasks belong to certain classes, etc. By being able to view these relationships, the users will be able to tell what tasks must be completed before other tasks can be completed.

Referring to claims 10 and 19, while O'Brien teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, he fails to explicitly teach the internal server (host server) comparing the progress data with the schedule. Matsuzaki et al. teach a system managing a schedule similar to

that of O'Brien. In addition, Matsuzaki et al. further teach comparing the progress data with the schedule (comparing the estimated schedule corresponding to progress data with the target schedule) to assign a mark to the progress data in accordance with the comparison result (calculate a discrepancy between the estimated schedule and the target schedule) and to display the progress by the mark (providing the results of the comparison), as recited in column 7, lines 66-67, column 8, lines 1-10 and column 21, lines 31-40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the schedule management system of O'Brien to include the comparison of the progress data to the schedule, as taught by Matsuzaki et al. It would have been obvious to make such a combination in order to allow users of the schedule system to easily update and view the progress of the tasks being worked on. Furthermore, it would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination so the users can see how closely the actual progress of the tasks matches up to the ideal schedule set. The users can see how much more work needs to be done in order to finish the task on time.

Referring to claims 11, 20 and 21, while O'Brien teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, he fails to explicitly teach the internal server (host server) configured to provide a page for viewing or editing a schedule in response to a selection of the displayed progress of the schedule. Matsuzaki et al. teach a system managing a schedule similar to that of O'Brien. In addition, Matsuzaki et al. further teach providing a page for editing a schedule in response to a selection of the schedule on the screen where the progress of the schedule is displayed (the users have the options to edit the schedule, for example, change the order of the activities, if the difference between the estimated schedule and the target schedule is too great),

as recited in column 8, lines 23-30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the schedule management system of O'Brien to include updating of the progress of tasks, as taught by Matsuzaki et al. It would have been obvious to make such a combination in order to allow users of the schedule system to easily update and view the progress of the tasks being worked on. Furthermore, it would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination to allow users to view and cater their planned schedules for tasks to better correlate with the actual progress of the tasks.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 12 March 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the O'Brien reference fails to disclose permitting the managing party to modify a schedule provided on the internal sever while the managed parties refer to a schedule provided on a public web server, thus preventing the managed parties from gaining direct access to the schedule on the internal server of the managing party. O'Brien teaches a schedule management system comprising a schedule table provided on the internal server (host server), the schedule table storing a schedule created by the managing party (column 1, lines 58-66 and column 2, lines 16-33), a common schedule table provided on the public web server (displaying the schedule to the client side machines via an online connection to the Internet) (column 2, lines 1-5 and column 3, lines 5-8), the common schedule table storing the schedule

transferred from the internal server so that the managed parties refer to the schedule (the host server sends information regarding the schedule, such as displaying a final schedule, to the client side machine via a display and an Internet connection) (column 1, lines 58-66 and column 6, lines 18-25) and receiving means provided on the public web server, the receiving means receiving modification data from one or more of the managed parties, wherein the internal server is configured to receive the modification data from the public web server (users can generate, update and view the schedule via options on the online display menu) (column 2, lines 16-33, column 4, lines 58-67 and column 6, lines 18-51), modify the schedule stored in the schedule table with the modification data, and transfer the modified schedule to the common schedule table (revising, updating and regenerating the schedule) (column 2, lines 25-33 and column 6, lines 18-51), wherein the internal server is further configured to reject a direct access from the managed parties (the users of the system cannot directly access schedule information stored on the host server; modification and updates to the schedule are processed by receiving user commands from the online display menu) (column 3, lines 24-34 and column 6, lines 18-30). This is further shown in Figures 3 and 5. The managing party (host) manages a schedule on the internal server (host server), while the managed parties (which are client side machines consisting of both managers and employees using the online system) refer to a schedule provided on a public web server (online display of the schedule via a web connection to the Internet). Access to the schedule stored on the host server is not directly accessed by the users (managers and employees using the online system); instead, the users have to access the displayed website menu in order to view and update schedule information. Therefore, it can be seen that the O'Brien reference anticipates the subject invention.

Furthermore, the applicant asserts that there is no *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness can be made to combine the teaching of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. However, O'Brien teaches a schedule management system in which the management of the schedule is segregated between the web server (web menu display for viewing and updating the schedule) and the internal server (host server storing information regarding the schedule) (column 1, lines 58-67, column 2, lines 16-33 and column 6, lines 18-50). Although O'Brien fails to explicitly teach receiving and displaying progress data, as claimed in the dependent claims of the subject invention, Matsuzaki et al. also teach a system for managing and displaying a schedule. In addition, Matsuzaki et al. further teach recording, receiving and displaying progress data in the schedule stored in the schedule table (column 1, lines 63-67, column 2, lines 1-6 and column 9, lines 40-46 and further shown in Figure 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of O'Brien and Matsuzaki et al. in order to allow users of the schedule system to easily update and view the progress of the tasks being worked on, or updated in the host server; users can see how close to completion the tasks and updates are.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (703) 305-0328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 26, 2004

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER